



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,457	02/20/2001	Laurent Gavaille	19251	5028

26480 7590 05/27/2005

LAWRENCE E. LAUBSCHER, SR.  
LAUBSCHER LAW OFFICES  
1160 SPA ROAD  
SUITE 2B  
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21403

EXAMINER
----------

CHANKONG, DOHM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No. .

09/785,457

Applicant(s)

GAVOILLE, LAURENT

Examiner

Dohm Chankong

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2005.  
2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.0.0.1

### DETAILED ACTION

1> This action is in response to Applicant's amendment and remarks. Claim 5 has been cancelled. Claims 1-4 are presented for further examination. This action is a final rejection.

#### *Response to Arguments*

2> Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 have been carefully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment ("only in said given terminal when said given terminal has recognized said address of said given terminal...") that altered the scope of the claims.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3> Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by Peters, U.S Patent No. 6,601,093.

Art Unit: 2152

4> As to claim 1, Peters discloses a method of constructing directories in terminals connected by a local area network, said method including the following steps following on automatically from a given terminal being connected with said network [column 7 «lines 25-30 and 45-48» where : it is well known in the art that a device would need an IP address when it is newly connected to a network]:

broadcasting a message from said given terminal in the network, the broadcast message containing at least a name and address of said given terminal [column 3 «lines 20-31 and 44-50» : Peters “first device” is comparable to a given terminal];

in at least one other terminal, decoding said broadcast message, extracting from it a name and an address of said given terminal, inserting the extracted name and address in mapping relationship into a directory of said other terminal, and transmitting a response message containing the address of said given terminal as a receiver address extracted from said broadcast message and at least a name and an address of said other terminal [column 3 «lines 20-50» | column 7 «lines 29-39» where : Peters address table is comparable to claimed directory and his second device is comparable to said other terminal];

only in said given terminal when said given terminal has recognized said address of said given terminal in said response message, extracting said name and said address of said other terminal from said response message, and inserting the extracted name and address in mapping relationship into a directory of said given terminal [column 3 «lines 20-50» | column 7 «lines 24-39» | column 8 «lines 44-55» where : it is inherent in Peters that said given terminal recognized the address in said response message. Peters discloses that the response message is addressed only to said given terminal and the message is received by the given

Art Unit: 2152

terminal. Therefore, the given terminal must have received the message based on the fact that the message was expressly addressed to it].

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5> Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters, in view of Matsubara et al, U.S Patent No. 6,335,812 ["Matsubara"].

6> Peters does not explicitly disclose a method wherein said given terminal and plural other terminals in said network define a group of terminals associated with an identifier, and said broadcast message includes said identifier so that only said plural other terminals decode said broadcast message to extract it from said name and said address of said terminal.

7> In the similar field of invention, Matsubara is directed towards communications between terminals in a local area network. Matsubara discloses a method wherein said given terminal and plural other terminals in said network define a group of terminals associated with an identifier, and said broadcast message includes said identifier so that only said plural other terminals decode said broadcast message to extract from it said name and said address

of said given terminal [column 16 «lines 35-66» : “group identifier”]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Matsubara’s group identification functionality into Peters system. Peters discloses that his devices can be separated into various sections [see Figure 1]. One would have been motivated to perform such an implementation in Peters to enable efficient identification of Peters’ various devices.

8> Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters, in view of La Porta et al, U.S Patent No. 6,434,134 [“La Porta”].

9> Peters does teach the construction of a directory (address table mapping the host name and address) in response to the broadcast message and the response message [column 3 «lines 20-31» | column 8 «lines 44-55»] but does specifically disclose the use of a directory construction function field included in the messages.

10> Since Peters discloses creating of a directory in at terminal when receiving a broadcast and response message from other terminals, the use of a function field is implicit in Peters message. Furthermore, La Porta discloses a message that includes a directory construction function field [Figure 9 «item 310» | Figure 10 «item 346» | column 12 «lines 50-65»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Peters’ message to include the directory construction function field for the purposes of storing the information necessary to construct the directory (table entries) by the receiving terminal.

Art Unit: 2152

11> Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters, in view of Tello et al, U.S Patent No. 6,381,634 ["Tello"].

12> Peters discloses a method wherein said address contained in said broadcast message or in said response message includes a sender terminal address conforming to the internet protocol address of said sender terminal [column 3 «lines 16-55»], but does not disclose an electronic mail address.

13> It is well known in the art that IP addresses can represent an electronic mail address. For example, Tello discloses an IP header packet that includes an electronic mail address in the source IP address header [Figure 5 «item 622»]. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have reasonably inferred that Peters' IP address could be replaced with an electronic mail address as taught by Tello. One would have been motivated to perform such a replacement because electronic mail addresses are easier to read and understand by humans and therefore would allow a user to quickly identify the destination or source address of a terminal.

### *Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2152


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is (571)272-3942. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DC



Dung C. Dinh  
Primary Examiner